

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WELDON LONG,

14 Defendant.

Case No. 2:95-cr-00184-LDG

ORDER

15
16 The defendant, Weldon Long, moves to quash subpoenas (#444) issued by the
17 United States to JP Morgan Chase NA. In the alternative, Long seeks a protective order.
18 The United States has filed a response (#445).

19 Long has not shown that he has standing to bring a motion to quash the subpoenas.
20 He argues that there is precedent in this district supporting the quashing of a motion issued
21 to a non-party bank, but does not cite to any decision of this district in which the court
22 concluded the movant had standing to move to quash such a subpoena. At most, in *Wells*
23 *Fargo v. Iny*, 2014 WL 1796216 (D. Nev. May 6, 2014), the court assumed that standing
24 existed for purposes of that specific motion, and went on to deny the motion on the merits.
25 In so doing, the court cited two previous decisions in this district, each of which declined to

1 find standing. See, *In re: Rhodes Cos.*, 475 B.R. 733, 740–41 (D.Nev. 2012); *Salem
2 Vegas, L.P. v. Guanci*, 2013 WL 5493126, *2–3 (D.Nev. Sept. 30, 2013).

3 Long argues that, pursuant to Rule 26(c)(1), he is permitted to seek a protective
4 order. Presumably, Long seeks an order forbidding the bank from disclosing the
5 subpoenaed documents. Long has not, however, established that such an order is
6 necessary to protect him from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or
7 expense, or that an order equivalent to the quashing of the subpoena is appropriate.

8 While the bulk of Long’s motion is devoted to arguing that the restitution order is
9 defective or void, he has not shown that a motion to quash or a motion for protective order
10 precluding the disclosure of the requested records is the appropriate procedure by which to
11 collaterally challenge the Judgment. Accordingly, for good cause shown,

12 THE COURT ORDERS that defendant Weldon Long’s Motion to Quash or, in the
13 Alternative, for Protective Order (#444) is DENIED.

14

15 DATED this 19 day of January, 2016.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26



Lloyd D. George
United States District Judge